

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 12-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4-11 are canceled. Claim 2 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 1 and claims 12-17 are amended to correct their dependencies. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Formal Matters Satisfied

The Office Action objects to the title of the invention and the Abstract. By this Amendment, the title has been amended to more clearly reflect the subject matter to which the claims are directed. Regarding the Abstract, Applicants submit that the substitute Abstract that was submitted with the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment filed on March 12, 2002 is acceptable. Applicants assume that the Patent Office has failed to consider the substitute Abstract submitted with that Amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title as well as the Abstract be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone if, for some reason, the substitute Abstract is not present in the PTO file.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,250 to Murakami et al. ("Murakami"); and rejects claims 1 and 4-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,195,143 to Ogawa. At the outset, Applicants note that the rejection of claims 1 and 4-11 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims. The rejections that apply to remaining claims 2 and 12-18 are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Murakami fails to disclose or suggest a projector comprising, *inter alia*, a light source, a liquid crystal device which modulates light emitted from the light source, the liquid crystal device having a base substrate that has a plurality of pixel electrodes disposed in a matrix arrangement and a plurality of drive elements

corresponding to the pixel electrodes and electrically coupled therewith, a projection lens which projects the light modulated by the liquid crystal device and condenser lens being further provided at a light-incident side of the liquid crystal device and, by shifting a center axis of light incident upon the condenser lens and an optical axis of the condenser lens in parallel so that the incident angle of light that strikes the drive elements becomes small when the center axis of light incident upon the condenser lens and the optical axis of the condenser lens coincide, the angle of the light incident upon the liquid crystal device is restricted, as recited in claim 2.

Murakami discloses a condenser lens which causes light beams from a reflecting mirror to be condensed and concentrated as substantially collimated light beams. However, nowhere in Murakami is there disclosure or suggestion that by shifting a center axis of light incident upon the condenser lens and an optical axis of the condenser lens in parallel so that the incident angle of light that strikes the drive elements become small and the center axis of the light incident upon the condenser lens and the optical axis of the lens coincide, the angle of light incident upon the liquid crystal device is restricted. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is patentable over Murakami. Claims 3, 17 and 18 are also patentable over Murakami for at least the same reasons as claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Ogawa teaches a liquid crystal device comprising an array of micro lenses arranged in a matrix that divides illumination light into a plurality of partial light beams and converges the light beams to a light incident plane of the pixel. The Office Action analogizes the micro lenses to the condenser lens recited in claim 2. The device of Ogawa enhances contrast by positioning each micro lens so that a line connecting the optical center of the micro lens to the center of the incident surface of the corresponding pixel is substantially parallel to the clear viewing direction. However, nowhere in Ogawa is there suggestion that the angle of light


incident upon the liquid crystal device is restricted by shifting a center axis of light incident upon the condenser lens and an optical axis of the condenser lens in parallel so that the incident angle of light that strikes the drive elements become small when the center axis of the light incident upon the condenser lens and the optical axis of the condenser lens coincide, as recited in claim 2. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is patentable over Ogawa. Claims 3 and 12-18 are also patentable over Ogawa for at least the same reasons as claim 2, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over Ogawa.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2, 3 and 12-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Phillip D. Mancini
Registration No. 46,743

JAO:PDM/ccs
Date: September 12, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--